

**PATENT**Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

By virtue of the amendments above, Claims 1, 5, 24, 26, and 29 have been amended and Claims 16-23 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Claims 1-15 and 24-34 are pending, of which, Claims 1 and 24 are independent.

No new matter has been introduced by way of the claim amendments; entry thereof is therefore respectfully requested.

**Restriction Requirement**

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Restriction Requirement, Applicants have canceled the non-elected Claims 16-23 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

**Drawings**

The indication that the drawings filed on April 20, 2007 have been accepted is noted with appreciation.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The test for determining if a reference anticipates a claim, for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, is whether the reference discloses all the elements of the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents thereof functioning in substantially the same way

## PATENT

Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829

to produce substantially the same results. As noted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Court stated:

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.

Therefore, if the cited reference does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, then the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claims 1-5, 12-14, 24-26, and 29-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over the disclosure contained in U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0243415 to Lowe et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claims 1 and 24 have been amended to include, *inter alia*, that the cross-sectional area at the input of each light guide is formed of a first dimension and a second dimension and wherein the cross-sectional area of the output of each light guide is formed of a third dimension and a fourth dimension, and wherein the third dimension is equal to the first dimensions and the fourth dimension is larger than the second dimension.

Support for these amendments may at least be found in Figure 2 of the originally filed application. As shown in that figure, the input location 201 is depicted as having a height (first dimension) and a width (second dimension), and the output location 202 is depicted as having a height (third dimension) and a width (fourth dimension). In addition, although the heights of the input location 201 and the output location 202 are the same, the widths differ

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829

from each other. More particularly, the widths of the light guides at the output location 202 are larger than the widths at the input location. In addition, the output locations 202 of the light guides are beveled to enable an image outputted through the output locations 202 to have the same aspect ratio as an image inputted through the input locations 201.

The Official Action has rejected Claims 1 and 24 based upon the disclosure contained in Lowe et al. Although Lowe et al. appears to show that the output ends of the light transmission guides have relatively larger cross-sectional areas as compared with the input ends of the light transmission guides, Lowe et al. fails to show that one of the dimensions of the output ends is equal to one of the dimensions of the input ends and that the other of the dimensions of the output ends is larger than the other of the dimensions of the input ends. As such, Lowe et al. fails to disclose that the cross-sectional area at the input of each light guide is formed of a first dimension and a second dimension and wherein the cross-sectional area of the output of each light guide is formed of a third dimension and a fourth dimension, and wherein the third dimension is equal to the first dimensions and the fourth dimension is larger than the second dimension, as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 24.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lowe et al. fails to disclose each and every element claimed in independent Claims 1 and 24 of the present invention and therefore cannot anticipate these claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection and to allow Claims 1 and 24 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Claims 2-5, 12-14, 25, 26, 29, and 30 are also allowable over Lowe et al. for reasons in addition to those discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 24. For instance, with regard to Claims 5 and 26, Lowe et al. fails to disclose that the outputs of the light guides comprise beveled surfaces configured to cause the larger optical representation

**PATENT****Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1  
App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829**

output to have the same aspect ratio as the small original optical representation. Instead, because Lowe et al. discloses that the aspect ratios of the cross-sectional areas of inputs and outputs are the same, Lowe et al. clearly fails to disclose that the outputs have beveled ends since beveled ends would cause the aspect ratios of the images outputted from the light guides of Lowe et al. to differ from the aspect ratios of the images inputted into the light guides. In fact, in the fifth paragraph of the Official Action, Lowe et al. is indicated as failing to "explicitly disclose a beveled output section."

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 6-9, 15, 27, 28, and 31-34 have been rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0243415 to Lowe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,031,954 to Higuchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Official Action correctly notes that Lowe et al. fails to disclose a beveled output section. In an effort to cure this deficiency in Lowe et al., the Official Action relies upon the disclosure contained in Higuchi for its disclosure of "an output that is beveled to improve picture quality." (Official Action, page 4, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph). This section of the Official Action, however, does not address nor cures the deficiencies in Lowe et al. discussed above. More particularly, for instance, this section of the Official Action fails to establish that Lowe et al. or Higuchi discloses that the cross-sectional area at the input of each light guide is formed of a first dimension and a second dimension, and wherein the cross-sectional area of the output of each light guide is formed of a third dimension and a fourth dimension, and wherein the

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829

third dimension is equal to the first dimension and the fourth dimension is larger than the second dimension, as claimed in independent Claims 1 and 24.

Accordingly, Lowe et al. and Higuchi, considered singly or in combination, fail to render all of the features of at least independent Claims 1 and 24 of the present invention obvious. Accordingly, Claims 6-9, 15, 27, 28, and 31-34, which depend from independent Claims 1 and 24, respectively, are also allowable over the disclosures contained in Lowe et al. and Higuchi. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of Claims 6-9, 15, 27, 28, and 31-34, and to allow these claims.

In setting forth the rejection in paragraph 5, it should be noted that the Official Action has failed to address many of the features claimed in Claims 6-9, 15, 27, 28, and 31-34. For instance, the Official Action has failed to prove that either Lowe et al. or Higuchi discloses a reflecting element comprising at least one reflector, as claimed in Claim 6. As another example, the Official Action has failed to prove that either Lowe et al. or Higuchi discloses a reflecting element having a plurality of reflectors oriented to receive multiple light beams, as claimed in Claim 7. The Official Action has, moreover, failed to provide any motivation or justification for combining Lowe et al. and Higuchi to teach any of these claimed features. Clearly, therefore, the rejection of Claims 6-9, 15, 27, 28, and 31-34 is improper and should be withdrawn.

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 200309594-1

App. Ser. No.: 10/698,829

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2008

By

  
Timothy B. Kang  
Registration No.: 46,423

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.  
8221 Old Courthouse Road  
Suite 104  
Vienna, VA 22182  
(703) 652-3817  
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)